

# BULLETIN

OF THE

## BROOKLYN ENTOMOLOGICAL SOCIETY

---

---

VOL. XXXV

FEBRUARY, 1940

No. I

---

---

### DEJEAN CATALOGUE NAMES (COLEOPTERA).

BY H. S. BARBER AND J. C. BRIDWELL, Washington, D. C.

The present note is intended to clarify ideas on validity, authorship and date of many familiar generic names in Chrysomelidae which, under the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, appear to be valid in the Dejean catalogues. Most of these names are believed to date from early in 1837 as explained below, but are incorrectly cited as of 1835 in the new *Nomenclator Zoologicus* by S. A. Neave and are there regarded as *nomina nuda*. This date, 1835, is also ascribed to them in the yet unfinished *Nomenclator Animalium* (Schulze, Berlin 1926-1938) where their treatment as to validity is variable. In contrast to the rejection of the Dejean Catalogue names one encounters the unquestioned adoption of similarly proposed names from the Billberg Catalogue. Many are averse to the consideration of these names, perhaps through mere misunderstanding of the motives which produced them and of the manner in which they have come into use. Examinations of certain cases show misapplications demanding correction of names applied to a few well known species in our fauna, as well as the renaming of two neotropical genera.

We are convinced that increase in knowledge of Coleoptera has been influenced more by the Dejean Catalogue than by any other single volume known to us. It stood for half a century as the "bible" of the coleopterist. Names taken from it were used in good faith by almost all workers. Then arose a concept of generic validity under which these names were claimed to be of no significance because characterizations were not given and, on this assumption, some of these names were freely used for other genera. The conflict of names resulting contrasts strongly with the constructive work of the great builders of our system who adopted these names in their original applications and whose results usually agree well with those attainable now by a strict and impersonal application of

the rules of the International Code. If as is customary we recognize a generic name as established by designation of a known species as its genotype or if a name became valid<sup>1</sup> by mere mention of the names of the species to be included, there should be no objection to new generic names proposed in this catalogue for listed species accompanied by bibliographical citation to prior descriptions. The author name following the specific name in the Dejean Catalogue is such a bibliographical citation and, except in rare cases, there can be no doubt as to which old species are included in the new genera.

In each case where the new generic name covers only specific *nomina nuda*, the generic name should be considered a *nomen nudum*, available for free use by a subsequent author, and in such cases we believe these later contributors have usually applied the name in the identical sense as in the Dejean collection, which was the basis of the catalogue. On the other hand, new generic names followed by included valid specific names with cited abbreviation of author, should be regarded as valid and the application of each determined by selection of an included valid species as genotype. Even the *nomina nuda* from Dejean were listed as valid in Agassiz and Erichson 1846 (*Nomenclator Zoologicus*, Coleoptera).

The last *livraison* of that edition of the Dejean Catalogue which usually bears a title page date 1833 has not been satisfactorily explained and dated. It is generally known that the earlier parts appeared in 1833, 1834 and 1835 as separate fascicles in covers numbered 1 to 4. The last or fifth part, in which most of these chrysomelid names appear, was not issued up to the time of the great fire of December 12, 1835 (*Ann. Soc. Ent. France*, vol. 4, p. XC), which destroyed all of the undistributed edition and an appalling number of other French works on insects. Yet there are in numerous libraries apparently complete copies with title page date 1833 and including part 5. The reason for their existence we can now explain.

Announcement by Dejean that publication of this fifth part has been delayed and that a new edition of the burned catalogue has been started appears after February 15, 1836 (*Ann. Soc. Ent. France*, vol. 4, p. cxxii). A later announcement (*l. c.*, vol. 5, p. xiv) after October 1836 mentions part 5 as in press. It was finally presented at the meeting of July 5, 1837. According to our investigations this part consists of pages 361-442 of the volumes bearing title-page date 1833, and pages 385-466 in the last edition with

---

<sup>1</sup> Prior to Jan. 1, 1931, when Article 25c of the Code became effective.

title-page date 1837, or rarely 1836. If, as has been done by the writers, several copies of these two editions of the Dejean catalogues be assembled and compared,<sup>2</sup> it will be found that every

<sup>2</sup> Explanations of the Dejean catalogues by Boisduval 1845 (Ann. Soc. Ent. France, ser. 2, vol. 3, pp. 501, 504, 509), Hagen 1862 (Bibliotheca Entomologica, p. 165), Kraatz 1874 (Berlin. Ent. Ztschr., vol. 18, p. 212), Sherborn 1922 (Index Animalium II, p. xlii) Griffin 1932 (Ann. and Mag. Nat. Hist., ser. 10, vol. 9, p. 178) and Schenkling 1932 (Wiener. Ent. Ztschr., vol. 49, p. 309) disagree greatly and we are unable to apply any of these interpretations *in toto* to the several copies we have studied. The blue temporary covers of the four fascicles of the "1833" edition appear to have been used indifferently in the filling of orders up to the burning of the entire undistributed stock in December 1835. Book dealers may, even since then, have exchanged parts and covers. If, as we believe, different title-pages were issued with part 1 in 1836 and part 5 in 1837 and the binder discarded the wrong one, Griffin's 5 editions and other errors in Hagen and in Kraatz may be understood. Our guess is that an 1836 title-page appeared with the first part of the "Troisième Édition," the fifth part of which was unexpectedly delayed until after April 1837 and that a new title-page accompanied the *Avertissement* (pp. v-xiv), *Recapitulation* (p. 467), *Table Alphabetique* (pp. 469-499) and *Errata* (pp. 500-503) which were issued with Fascicle 5 prior to July 5, 1837. Replacement of a missing or damaged title-page of the 1833 edition with a spare title-page of the 1836 edition may account for edition 4 in the Griffin interpretation. Such a title-page is bound in a copy (Casey library) which is otherwise identical with the usual 1837 edition.

Postscript—Schenkling's account (1932 above inserted) of these catalogues was unnoticed by us until after the present paper was in the printer's hands. It requires no change in our results and appears to be correct except in two details: The inference that Dejean had been lax in citing his catalogues, and the claim, in agreement with Griffin 1932, of a separate 1836 edition. Dejean never cited his first list (1802) as his first edition but in his 1833 and 1837 volumes cites his 1821 volume as "Dej. Cat." and, in the 1837 volume, cites the 1833 volume as "Dej. Cat. 2." Subsequent works seem to cite these three volumes consistently as editions I, II and III until Hagen listed the 1802 pamphlet as the first edition and considered the "troisieme" edition as the fourth. This beginner's catalogue of 1802 merely lists the species which Dejean was able to

item, and each broken or malformed character in the typography of these pages appears identical in the editions having title-page dates 1833, 1836 and 1837, except the numerals indicating pagination and signature. The writers are convinced that the publication and issuance of pages 385-466 as part 5 for addition to the four parts distributed in 1833 to 1835 was from the exact forms from which the "Troisième Édition" was published in 1837 and is of that date, the pagination, signature, and recapitulation, p. 443, being necessarily changed. Boisduval 1845 (Ann. Soc. Ent. France, ser. 2, vol. 3, p. 509) mentions the fourth and last part, but the announcements (*l. c.*, 1837, vol. 6, Bul. p. XIV, and p. LIII.) indicate that the 1837 edition appeared in five parts as was intended for the volume with title-page date 1833. Identity of part 5 in the "1833" and 1837 editions is proven by identity of typography alone, but Boisduval also states this fact. Its date must be between the meetings of the society of March 1 and July 5, 1837. April 1837 is the date of the introduction signed by Dejean.

Some confusing duplication appears in copies of the "1833" edition thus completed. Attention is especially called to p. 361, which is identical with p. 385 of the 1837 volume. In the latter it is plain that the 31 species listed in column 1 are part of the 40 species of *Megalopus* which also appear on p. 358 of the "1833" volume, except that *bicolor* Klug has been added. These 31 specific names seem thereby to have been included in the genus *Alurnus*, but the species have no affinity with that genus. It should also be of interest that *Lema* appears on pp. 359-360 with 97 species and again on pp. 362-363 with 102 species, an increase of 5 species between 1835 and 1837, the respective dates of parts 4 and 5. Five other genera are similarly repeated on pp. 361-363 of the 1837 part in the "1833" edition.

In the introduction (p. xiii) to the third, or 1837, edition (no introduction or index appeared for the 1833 edition) responsibility is given to Chevrolat for all of the genera which he has proposed out of the ancient great genera *Hispa*, *Cassida*, *Galeruca*, *Altica*, *Chrysomela*, *Colaspis*, *Eumolpus*, *Clythra*, *Cryptocephalus*, etc. This statement not only fixes Chevrolat as author of most of the new generic names but definitely connects most of the species included in the new genera with their prior generic positions, which is apparent, however, to anyone familiar with the then available identity from the just published Fabrician volumes. It marks the beginning (when Dejean was 22) of his career as the great harmonizer of his entomological colleagues and of their views on classification.

literature even were the introductory statement not considered. Thus Chevrolat's great reclassification of Chrysomelidae considers 301 genera, of which 66 are ascribed to Dejean, 189 to Chevrolat, and 46 others to 16 other authors.

Genotype designations for thirty-one genera of cassidids were published in 1842 (Duponchel and Chevrolat in D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 210), but these have been ignored for almost a century. Some of them, as well as some of the indicated synonymy then offered, are admittedly invalid but most are acceptable and are explanatory of a long continued divergence in the application of the names. The correct analysis of old contributions, as to both nomenclature and zoology, and their accurate cataloguing is indispensable to revisional studies. These aspects of the nomenclature of the cassidids are, unfortunately, not considered in the admirable contribution on generic limitations by Spaeth 1913 (Archiv f. Naturgesch., vol. 79, A, heft 6, pp. 126-164), and it is suggested below that several of the generic names therein adopted are now to be cited in synonymy.

A list of these chrysomelid genera with their genotypes has been contemplated, but accurate determination of the latter requires such extensive search through literature that its completion has not been possible. Numerous genotypes are established by Duponchel and Chevrolat, or by others in subsequent papers, and recent arbitrary selections are often erroneous as in the case of *Deloyala*, mentioned below. A few examples from the many cases examined are offered in illustration of the diverse problems encountered. We believe that stability of nomenclature is possible only by impersonal application of rules and that the International Code is the only basis for procedure which we can follow, since its rules were unanimously agreed upon by a properly constituted and authorized international body.

*Haemonia* "Megerle" Dejean 1835 ("1833" ed. p. 357), 1836 ("1837" ed. p. 384) attained validity in Dejean 1821 (p. 114), where it is based upon *equisetae* F. and *zosteræ* F. *Apelma* Billberg 1820<sup>3</sup> and *Macroplea* Samouelle 1819 are established

<sup>3</sup> Citation to author being often not attached to the specific names in Billberg 1820, the validity of his new generic names seemed questionable until it was found that the numerals "1.3.98" under *Apelma* are the bibliographical citation to Schoenherr 1817 (Synonymia Insectorum, vol. 1, pt. 3, p. 98) where the bibliography of *Donacia zosteræ* F. is given. In other cases investigated, the dash (—), when used under habitat or page numeral, is equivalent to ditto.

on the same two species in virtually the same manner. Curtis 1830 and Westwood 1840 have designated *Donacia zosterae* F. the genotype of *Macrophea* which, being prior, is to be adopted. The three generic names are isogenotypic synonyms by present designation of *D. zosterae* F. as genotype of *Haemonia* and *Apelma*.

*Megascelis* Dej. appears as a *nomen nudum* on p. 114 of the 1821 edition of the Dejean Catalogue, and reappears in the 1833 edition on p. 358 which was published in 1835 and on p. 361 which was published in 1837 (this being identical with p. 385 of volumes with title-page dates 1836 or 1837), each of the latter including valid specific names. Clavareau 1913 (Coleop. Cat. Junk, pt. 58, p. 3) ascribes the name to Latreille 1829 where valid species are also included, but the name attained validity in Sturm 1826 (Cat. meiner Ins. Samml., p. 80, tab. 4, fig. 36) where *Megascelis aenea* is described and figured and is to be considered the genotype. Lacordaire 1845 (Monog. Coleop. Phyt., pt. 1, p. 254) explicitly cites Sturm, but Clavareau has omitted these citations.

*Gastrophysa* Chev. 1837 (pp. 405, 429) is valid as stated in Chapuis 1874 (Gen. Coleop., vol. 10, p. 371). Its genotype, *Chryso-mela polygomi* F., designated by Chevrolat 1846 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 6, p. 34) is also that of *Gastroeidea* Hope 1840 by original designation and of *Gastroidea* G. & H. 1874.

*Anisodera* Chev. 1837 (pp. 363, 387). The result attained by Maulik 1916 (Zool. Soc. London, Proc. 1916, pp. 569-570) is not altered by acceptance of the Dejean Catalogue. The originally fixed genotype is *Alurnus ferruginea* F. 1801 and not *A. excavata* as designated by Baly 1859.

*Callistola* Dejean 1837 (pp. 363, 387) is valid and monobasic, *Hispa speciosa* Boisduval 1835 being its genotype as stated by Guérin 1840 (Rev. Zool., 1840, p. 333) and by Duponchel 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 59); "d'Urville" is a bibliographical citation. This species (*speciosa*) is listed by Weiss 1911 (Coleop. Cat. Junk, pt. 35, p. 47) under *Oxycephala* Guérin wrongly supposed to be valid in 1830, but the cited volume (Duperrey, Voyage—Coquille, Zool., vol. 2, pt. 2, div. 1, p. 142) is now believed to have been published about the end of 1838. An uncatalogued earlier validation of *Oxycephala cornigera* Guérin 1835 (Icon. Règne Anim. Ins.,

---

These bibliographical citations are acceptable as "indications" conferring validity upon the new generic names.

pl. 48, fig. 2) established priority of the latter monobasic genonym.

*Sceloenopla* Chev. 1837 (pp. 364, 388), genotype *Hispa spinipes* F. 1794, designated by Baly 1859, is valid and has been adopted by Uhmann 1937 (Mitt. Zool. Mus. Berlin, vol. 22, pp. 204-212) to suppress *Cephalodonta* Baly 1859 which is isogenotypic by original designation and includes also *Microdonta*, mentioned below.

*Cephalodonta*, a *nomen nudum* in Dejean 1837 (pp. 364, 388) and so cited by Neave 1939, becomes valid in Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 272) where *Chalepus goniapterus* Perty becomes its genotype. Neave 1939 cites validation by Guérin 1844, but the above mentioned genotype is there placed doubtfully in *Uroplata* instead of in the heterogeneous aggregate under *Cephalodonta*.

*Microdonta* Chev. 1837 (pp. 364, 388), genotype *Hispa serraticornis* F. designated by Chevrolat 1846 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 8, p. 197) conflicts with the scarabaeid genus proposed by Hope 1837 (Coleop. Manual, pt. 1, p. 105) but has been merged with *Sceloenopla* as above mentioned.

*Notosacantha* Chev. 1837 (pp. 367, 391), monobasic, genotype *Cassida echinata* F., also designated by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 210). An unsigned item in the same work 1846 (vol. 8, p. 677) mentions this genonym as synonym of *Hoplionota* Hope, but current use of the latter is to be discontinued because it is a subsequent isogenotypic synonym.

*Thyreomorpha* Dejean 1837 (pp. 367, 391) is a *nomen nudum* and does not become valid in either Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 or in Chevrolat 1849 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 12, p. 570). It attains monobasic validity by citation in synonymy in Boheman 1850 (p. 35) under *Hoplionota badia* Boh. its genotype.

*Imatidium* F. 1801 accepted in Chevrolat 1837 (pp. 367, 391), genotype *I. thoracicum* F., designation by Latreille 1810 (p. 432). Subsequent designation by Hope 1840, *I. trimaculatum* F. Subsequent designation in Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 *I. fasciatum* F. Spaeth 1938 (Rev. de Ent., Rio de Janeiro, vol. 9, p. 305) mentions the latter, *fasciatum* F. (= *capense* Hbst.) as the genotype. Malaise 1938 (Ent. Tidskr., vol. 59, p. 99-106) advances the belief that Fabricius indicated types of genera by detailed and extended descriptions of selected species and if this were acceptable Hope's genotype selection

- would stand, suppressing *Spilophora* Boh. and leaving *Imatidium* as we know the genus, without a name. Under the Code the first acceptable designation is by Latreille. *Himatidium* Illiger 1804 (Mag. f. Insectenkunde, vol. 3, p. 131) is accompanied by characterization, comments and specific mention, drawn from *Cassida bicornis*, *taurus* and *bidens* and might, for these reasons, supersede *Tauroma* Hope and *Omocerus* Chev. But it is best to regard it as an unnecessary emendation and misapplication of *Imatidium* F. under which it should be suppressed as isogenotypic because an allusion to Fabricius appears in the remarks. *Himatidium* Illiger (part) must, however, be cited in synonymy under *Omocerus*.
- Calliaspis* Dejean 1837 (pp. 367, 391), genotype *Cassida rubra* Oliv. 1808, designated in Duponchel 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 50, 210).
- Calyptocephala* Chev. 1837 (pp. 367, 391), genotype *Cassida nigricornis* Germ. 1824, present designation. The genotype designation in Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 may be rejected, *trigemina* being then still undescribed. This would permit continuance of the Boheman, Chapuis, Spaeth application of the genonym.
- Omocera* Chev. 1837 (pp. 367, 391) is a synonym of *Omocerus* Chev. 1835 (Coléoptères du Mexique, No. 119). Genotype, *Cassida bicornis* F. designated by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 211) citing, in synonymy, *Tauroma*, the originally designated genotype of which is *C. taurus*. Both of these genotypes, having been the basis of an overlooked generic concept by Illiger, a citation of *Himatidium* Illiger 1804 (part) should be catalogued in the generic synonymy.
- Polychalca* Chev. 1837 (pp. 368, 392) is valid. Genotype, *Cassida variolosa* F. 1801 (not Oliv. 1790) designated by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 211). *Pilidonota* Spaeth 1913 is isogenotypic by original designation. Being a primary homonym, *variolosa* should be suppressed as the name of this well known ornamental, used in jewelry, and the next available synonym, apparently *Cassida punctatissima* Wolf 1818 according to Spaeth 1914, should be adopted. *Desmonota* Hope 1839, genotype *Cassida platynota* Germ. 1824, by original designation, may be a subgenus of *Polychalca* Chev. (not Weise 1900). *Polychalca* Weise 1900 (Deut. Ent. Ztschr., vol. 44, p. 460) (not Chev.), invalid either as a homonym or because its designated genotype, *Cassida multicava* Latr. 1811, was assigned in another genus,



*Cyrtonota* Chev., includes 16 species catalogued in Spaeth 1914. No available substitute name being known to us we propose a new genonym, *Polychalma*, (etym. nul.) for the same genotype.

(**Polychalma** new name, *ante*, for *Polychalca* Weise 1900, not *Polychalca* Chev. 1837; genotype, *Cassida multivava* Latr. 1811 by present designation, the genotype designation by Weise 1900 being either an emendation or a *lapsus calami*.)

*Discomorpha* Chev. 1837 (pp. 368, 392), genotype *Cassida variegata* F., designated in Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 211), suppresses *Oxynoderia* Hope 1840 and *Bia* Weise 1896 (twice preoccupied) as isogenotypic synonyms. Another species, *D. palliata* (F.) = *longicornis* Guérin (Fabr. in error) is the genotype of the hitherto uncatalogued, monobasic generic name *Cyclosoma* Guérin 1835 (Icon. Règne Anim. Ins., pl. 48, fig. 5). This genonym is validated in the legend on the plate which is of prior date to the comments on p. 288 of the "Texte Insectes," 1844. Unfortunately this suppresses *Prenea* Spaeth 1913 which was proposed for *palliata* and nine other species. The exact date of *Cyclosoma* Guérin is unknown but the 111 plates of insects were announced as finished in 1835 (Bul. Zool., 1835, première section, p. 71, 72).

*Eugenysa* Chev. 1837 (pp. 368, 392), genotype *Cassida grossa* F., designated by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 211). *Calaspis* Hope 1840 and *Calaspidia* Hope 1840 are isogenotypic synonyms by original designation.

*Cyrtonota* Chev. 1837 (pp. 368, 392) is valid. Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 211) designate *Cassida lateralis* F. as its genotype. This species is originally included in *Neomphalia* Spaeth 1913 (Arch. f. Naturgesch., vol. 79, A, Heft 6, p. 131) and is its genotype by present designation. Among other valid specific names in *Cyrtonota* are: The originally designated genotype of *Mesomphalia* Hope, a species now catalogued in *Zatrephina* Spaeth, another now in *Polychalca* Weise (not Chev.), and ten others now in *Pseudomesomphalia* Spaeth. No type having been fixed for the latter genonym, we now designate *Cassida discors* F. its genotype. This is originally included by Spaeth's definition and remarks although not one of the few species mentioned by name in the brief comparisons of his new species. It is also one of five valid names included in *Pseudomesomphalia*

- and in *Stolas* Billberg 1820 and it is, by present designation, the genotype of the latter. *Pseudomesomphalia* Spaeth 1901 becomes therefore a synonym of *Stolas* Billberg 1820.
- Dorynota* Chev. 1837 (pp. 370, 394), genotype *Cassida bidens* F., designated by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 211) citing, in synonymy, *Batonota* Hope 1839, which is isogenotypic.
- Acromis* Chev. 1837 (pp. 370, 394), monobasic, genotype *Cassida spinifex* F., a listed synonym of which *C. perforata* F., is the genotype of *Selenis* Hope 1839. The latter is thus superseded as was shown by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842.
- Omaspides* Chev. 1837 (pp. 371, 395), genotype *Cassida transversa* F., designated in Hope 1840 (Coleop. Manual, pt. 3, p. 158) and in Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842. The genonym is ascribed to Boheman 1854 in Spaeth 1914 where *clathrata* L. (a prior synonym of *transversa*) is cited as type.
- Deloyala* Chev. 1837 (pp. 371, 395) is valid. Its genotype, designated by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 211) is *Cassida crux* F. *Chirida* Chapuis 1875, genotype *C. cruciata* L., designated by Weise 1896, falls as synonym of *Deloyala*, their genotypes being listed as conspecific. This old and overlooked designation makes the designation of *Cassida clavata* F. by Barber 1916 ineffective and permits the assignment of this species by Spaeth 1937 in his new subgenus where it appears as *Plagiometriona* (*Parametriona*) *clavata* (F.). Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842 cite *Aspidomorpha* in synonymy but its originally designated genotype, *C. miliaris* F., is not congeneric with that of *Deloyala* Chev. (= *Chirida* Chap.). *Deloyala* Redtenbacher 1858 is merely a misuse of the name applied to a group not originally included.
- Asteriza* Chev. 1837 (pp. 372, 396) is monobasic on *Cassida flavicornis* Oliv. 1790, which is cited as its type by Hope 1840 (p. 158) and by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842. The genonym is commonly ascribed to Boheman 1854 as in the catalogue by Spaeth 1914.
- Omoteina* Chev. 1837 (pp. 374, 398), monobasic, genotype *Cassida humeralis* Oliv. 1808, also cited by Duponchel and Chevrolat 1842. *Trikona* Maulik 1916 appears to be a synonym.
- Hemisphaerota* Chev. 1837 (p. 367, 391), genotype *Cassida erythrocerata* Germ. 1824, designated by Duponchel & Chevrolat 1842 (D'Orbigny, Dict. Univ. Hist. Nat., vol. 3, p. 210). *Porphyraspis* Hope 1840 is isogenotypic with *Hemisphaerota*.

The use of this name, *Hemisphaerota*, by Spaeth 1905 (Verh. Zool. Bot. Ges. Wien, vol. 55, p. 82) and in his catalogue 1914 (Coleop. Cat. Junk, pt. 62, p. 11) being untenable, we propose the new genonym *Spaethiella*, for the 22 species there listed and designate *Imatidium sanguineum* Fab. 1801 its genotype. (**Spaethiella** new name, *ante*, for *Hemisphaerota* Spaeth 1905, not Chev. 1837; genotype *Imatidium sanguineum* F. by present designation.)

The names of several well known North American species of beetles are affected by these examples. These changes from the names recently used to the new combinations, or to the readoption of names formerly in use and wrongly suppressed require mention.

1. Our rarely observed subaquatic free swimming donaciid *Haemonia nigricornis* Kby. changes to *Macroplea nigricornis* (Kby.) by priority of generic names, no validation of *Haemonia* "Megerle" prior to 1821 having been found.

2. Our several species of chrysomelids breeding on *Rumex* or *Polygonum*, listed as *Gastroidea*, should again be known by the prior name *Gastrophysa* Chev. as adopted by Redtenbacher, Chaquis and others.

3. The blue tortoise beetle of the palmetto, long known as *Porphyraspis cyanea* (Say) becomes *Hemisphaerota cyanea* (Say) by isogenotypic genonym priority. A much older description of this species, *Cassida flavicornis* Megerle 1803 (Catalogus Insectorum quae Viennae Austriae, die 28 Novembris 1803, auctionis lege distrahuntur, no. 394), based on a sample from Georgia probably from Abbott through Francillon, has been overlooked, but the name is preoccupied in Olivier 1790 and does not suppress *cyanea*.

4. The rough-backed tortoise beetle of ground cherry, horse nettle and white potato, recently known as *Deloyala clavata* (F.) becomes *Plagiometriona* (*Parametriona*) *clavata* (F.) Spaeth 1937, the early genotype designation restricting *Deloyala* to *Chirida*.

5. The name of the variable spotted tortoise beetle of morning glory and sweetpotato changes from *Chirida guttata* (Oliv.) to *Deloyala guttata* (Oliv.), the species being congeneric with the genotype of *Deloyala* designated in the overlooked contribution in 1842. *Deloyala guttata lucidula* (Boh.) is the pale variety or subspecies from New York to Iowa, and *D. guttata pennsylvanica* (Spaeth) is available for those melanic individuals in which the black dorsal area contains no yellow spots. *Deloyala lecontei* (Crotch 1873), of the Sonoran region, *Deloyala extensa* (Boh.), of the Rio Grande delta, and *Deloyala barberi* (Spaeth 1936), of the Florida everglades, appear to us to be distinct species. *Deloyala*

*extensa* (Boh.) is regarded by Spaeth 1936 (Ent. Rundsch., Jahrg. 53, p. 139) as a mere aberration of *Deloyala guttata immunita* (Boh.) of Yucatan, but our samples from Brownsville, Tex., and the original descriptions do not support this view.

**Synonymic Notes on *Dysdercus* A. & S. (Hemip).**—In 1926 Blatchley suggests that *Capsus ocreatus* Say is the same as *Dysdercus andreae* Linné. The former species was placed by Stål in *Dysdercus*. However, apparently it cannot be the same as the latter.

Say, in his description, unequivocally states: "beneath *immaculate*" (Italics mine). Now, the numerous specimens I have of *D. andreae*, determined both by Dr. R. F. Hussey and Mr. E. P. Van Duzee, all have the ventral segments distinctly white-margined posteriorly; and the sternal sclerites are also white posteriorly. This cannot have escaped Say, who, in *Capsus (Dysdercus) mimus* immediately following brings out that it is "beneath white, with the incisures sanguineous," which is a no more obvious character than the white incisures in *D. andreae*. We must conclude, therefore, that whatever Say may have had before him from Georgia, it was either an aberrant specimen of *andreae*, or else nearly certainly something quite different. At any rate, no one seems to have seen *Capsus ocreatus* since Say's day.

The only references to this species are: the original description; Stål's in *Enumeratio* (I: 124), where he says "Ad hanc familiam verisimiliter pertinent: 1. *Capsus ocreatus* Say" and a number of others he lists; Uhler, in his Check List, a mere mention; Van Duzee in his Catalogue omits Stål's citation; and Blatchley's (*Hem. E. N. Am.*, p. 442), where he advances the idea that *ocreatus* Say may be *andreae* L., without discussion. The latest reference is by Hussey, in his Catalogue of the Pyrrhocoridae (*General Catalogue of the Hemiptera*, fascicle III, p. 97). Obviously, none of these authors had seen an authentic specimen, and they knew it only from description.

In my 1912 paper "Records of Heteroptera from Brownsville, Texas" (*Ent. News*, XXIII, p. 121) I recorded *Dysdercus obscuratus* Dist. In his pending work on a survey of the Pyrrhocoridae, Dr. Hussey, in 1931, determined my specimens from Brownsville as *Dysdercus incertus* Distant, described from Costa Rica. Accordingly, this correction is made. This the first record of the species north of Mexico.—J. R. de la Torre-Bueno, Tucson, Arizona.